

- **CAC: “So, it really falls down to the PRGs, right?”** This is frustrating because it’s holding up our wonderful process. “What is so difficult?” The EPA and the Navy can’t find a solution. You have agreement on soil and background, but you don’t have agreement on the buildings. There has to be some way to break the impasse? “I know you (Derek) can’t speak to that right now. But, we have a representative from the EPA, let’s hear from you.”
 - EPA: The Navy and EPA are close on agreement for moving forward with soil reference background sampling.
 - EPA: The Navy and EPA seem to be in close agreement with getting in the field the soil rework on Parcel G.
 - EPA: We are still thinking about how to deal with the current, onsite buildings. I referred to the letter. I underscored that being in the field and moving work forward is a high priority. The path forward we outlined allows for work to begin, while we are still discussing the buildings.
- **CAC: “How long will it take to do that (talk about current, onsite buildings)?” Will we be here six months from now?**
 - EPA: I answered that I did not know. However, we are talking and that is good. Our managers a great conversation the previous week on the path forward, and we seem to be on the same page to move the work in a phased approach.
- **CAC: “That’s not an adequate enough answer for me, okay.” You are holding the Navy to your PRG requirements which may not be able to be met. Why are you holding them to that standard?**
 - EPA: Clarification to the audience on what the PRG Calculator is and that we built the PRG Calculator to help us implement our Superfund regulations. I introduced RESRAD. I mentioned the Navy is doing PRG Calculations on the buildings and they are struggling with it. We look forward to having a discussion with the Navy on what their outputs what their information is.
 - *Navy: Tried to come into the conversation but was talked-over by the CAC Chairwoman.*
- **CAC: “If you find out that the PRG cannot be done,” what will the EPA make some other kind of recommendation of what is required of the Navy.**
 - EPA: What comes out of the PRG are cleanup goals, or levels we think are appropriate to protect human health.
 - EPA: That information goes into the whole solution for how we clean up a site or how we protect people from exposure at a site. The remedy for a site can be multi-layered and multi-faceted. It does not need to be cleanup to that level. It can be cleanup to a certain level, followed by institutional controls to help mitigate exposure pathways. Then, I gave an example of urban gardens as an IC for soil.
 - EPA: “When cleanup levels are challenging to meet, we layer on other institutional controls to help mitigate that exposure.” So, if it comes out that cleanup goals for buildings are challenging to meet, then we will need to have a discussion on what other controls we can layer to protect people.
 - EPA: At the end of the day, we are concerned about making sure people are safe, if these current buildings are used for residential.
 - CAC: That’s why we are asking you. “Our number 1 concern is whether people are safe.”

- **CAC: Why can't you use RESRAD? "Doesn't it do the same thing as the PRG?"**
 - EPA: "It does similar things." We need to work together to work the model to implement Superfund regulations, which are very specific when addressing how to protect human health. We need to ensure RESRAD can comport to our regulations.
- **CAC: Hasn't RESRAD been used to cleanup other Shipyards with the same kinds of problems?**
 - EPA: "I don't know that answer to that." I asked Derek if he knew the answer to that question.
 - Navy: *Tried to answer the question but was talked-over by the CAC Chairwoman.*
 - CAC: So, have you been using the same PRG standards in other places you have cleaned up? The same standard you are requiring the Navy to use now.
 - EPA: I explained that is was not a normal situation where we would use current buildings that might be contaminated by radiation and thinking about using them for a residential use.
- **CAC: So you have used PRGs for commercial cleanup?** EPA: Yes. CAC: So, you are requiring the Navy to use the latest PRG standards because it's possibly residential? I'm just trying to understand this.
 - EPA: The PRG model can look at commercial buildings. I understand the Navy and EPA are in close agreement to the numbers. Then, I turned to the Navy.
 - Navy: In the past, we never differentiated between commercial and residential. We used one goal, determined by RESRAD and the State. The commercial run of the PRG Calculator is giving similar numbers to what we used in the past for "free release, which is statistically the same as background." It's a complicated question.
 - Navy: I can say that RESRAD works. "If we used RESRAD, we'd be good right now." But, that is still the conversation we are having with EPA.
 - EPA: It would depend on what your definition of "works" is.
- CAC: "Look at both of you." This was supposed to be all be done and that didn't happen. Now, this is supposed to be done by May 2nd – when I'm hearing is a meeting of the EPA and the Navy. "You (Yolanda) are looking as if you don't know (about this meeting)."
- EPA: I was confusing that you were referring to an in-person meeting.
- **CAC: I'm talking about EPA and the Navy sitting down at a final meeting to determine the standards to be used for the cleanup of the Hunters Point Shipyard. Is that the intent of the May 2nd meeting?**
 - EPA: My understanding of the intent of the May 2nd meeting is to discuss the proposed path forward that EPA put forth to the Navy.
- **CAC: Is it possible the PRG Calculator will produce goals that are below background levels?**
 - EPA: It's possible.
 - CAC: So, why are we holding on to the PRG Standards as the definitive issue that is keeping the Navy and EPA from an agreement?
 - EPA: We are deciding what levels are protective of human health, whether that comes from the PRG Calculator or RESRAD. That is a discussion we are having.
- **CAC: So you are willing to use RESRAD?**
 - EPA: That is one thing we discussed in our proposed path forward letter. We need to ensure RESRAD can be used in a way that complies with our regulations.
- **CAC: Who at EPA is making this determination?**

- EPA: It will be Region 9 management, in consultation with our HQ team.
- CAC: Who is the technical person from EPA? EPA: Lily Lee is the project manager. CAC: She's supposed to be on another job. Is she still working in that capacity? EPA: Yes. I will get back to you on names for the technical team, which may include Region 9 and HQ staff.
- **CAC: Are you hiring someone? Is there anyone on staff right now, that you can transfer the work to?**
 - EPA: We have put out an announcement to backfill for Lily. Lily is working almost full time on this site.
 - CAC: But, she has other responsibilities, and we are not seeing forward movement. "I'm just wondering what is really happening over there."
 - EPA: We are having a challenging discussion with the Navy.
 - CAC: You are having a challenging discussion and it's not coming together. I'm not trying to put you on the spot or grill you, I'm just being honest.
- **CAC: You need to come to a decision, which means to compromise.** There is a lot at stake; the community has a lot at stake.
- **There was a question from the audience about the impact of the lawsuit on our everyday work.**
 - EPA: No impact
- **Another CAC member: What day in May will you go and sample?**
 - Navy: We will be ready to go, three weeks after approval for the background sampling.
 - Navy: I feel like we are really close. I thought we were going to get approval last week to move forward, I think we might get approval this week.
 - Navy: Unfortunately, it's not up to me. We have people at very high levels making decisions, not me.
 - CAC: That's not a good answer. It's frustrating that you are coming here today without appropriate answers. The two of you should have talked last week. "The two of you are wasting our time." Everything you presented today we already knew. Next time you come back, you get us some dates. "We need something. You are holding up the work." I don't understand the reason.
 - CAC: "I hope you understand how frustrating this is for us." You need to take this frustration back with you.
- **CAC: Is the EPA really open to other options beyond the PRG Calculator?**
 - EPA: Our letter strongly recommended we stick with the PRG Calculator for soil, because we are in close agreement. While the soil work is underway, we will have time to discuss how we address the buildings.
 - EPA: We are phasing those discussions, in order to get work moving forward.
 - Navy: We are in agreement; we are happy to do that.
 - EPA: Again, we need to get in the field for the soil background soil testing.
- **CAC: I thought the background work plan was already approved.** Why are you not out there now? What am I not getting about this?
- **CAC: I don't understand why you can't get to agreement about RESRAD and PRG. How difficult is it? "It's holding everything up. You are killing this project." "You are not talking to each other; you need to compromise." "Come up with an agreement with what you are going to do."**

- **CAC: Will you make a promise to this community that you will engage in conversations that gets us close or reaches an agreement?**
 - EPA: We will continue to engage in these conversations to move this project forward.